

APPLICANT(S): Gabriel ILAN et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/674,710
FILED: January 29, 2000
Page 2

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8, 9, 11 – 17, 19, 22 – 29 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Schneider et al. (US 4,856,072). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

The Examiner states:

“Regarding claims 8, 9, 11 – 19, 22 – 29 and 33 Schneider et al. teaches an apparatus (fig. 1), comprising a voice recognition unit (16) to output (through item 42) a first command being voice signals; a handwriting recognition unit (22) to output (through item 18) a second command; ...” (OA, page 2, lines 17 – 20).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Unit 22 is a “keypad sensor” and Schneider et al. says the following about keypad sensor 22:

“The input/output circuit 18 is connected to receive sensor signals from various switches and sensor means such as a conventional alarm siren 19, a vehicle motion sensor 20, a keypad sensor 22, a hood sensor 24, an ignition switch sensor 26, a door lock control/sensor 28 and a light switch control/sensor 30.” (col. 2, lines 31 – 37)

“Sensor interrupts can include sensor interrupt signals from the vehicle motion sensor 20 (indicating the vehicle was moved), from the keypad sensor 22 (an operator entered code to enable the ignition and/or starter), from the hood sensor 24 (the hood was opened), from ignition switch sensor 26 (position of the switch), from the door lock control/sensor 28 (position of door locks), and from the light switch control/sensor 30 (position of the switch).” (col. 6, lines 27 - 36)

There are no other statements about unit 22 in Schneider et al. Thus, the only commentary that Schneider et al. provide about keypad sensor 22 is that it receives “an operator entered code to enable the ignition and/or starter”.

Moreover, the word “keypad” is defined in the Global Statements Dictionary (www.globalstatements.com) as “see numeric keypad” and “numeric keypad” is defined as “a section of a computer keyboard or a small separate keyboard for typing digits and related characters”. (Copies of the relevant Web pages are enclosed herein). Thus, despite the

APPLICANT(S): Gabriel ILAN et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/674,710
FILED: January 29, 2000
Page 3

Examiner's statements to the contrary, the word "keypad" or "keypad sensor" does not mean, nor does it connote, a handwriting recognition unit.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 8, 9, 11 – 17, 19, 22 – 29 and 33 are allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 8, 9, 11 – 17, 19, 22 – 29 and 33.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10, 21, 30 – 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Schneider et al. ('072) in view of Obradovich (US 6,282,464)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Schneider et al. has been discussed above. That discussion is applicable here. Obradovich cannot cure the deficiencies of Schneider et al. as Obradovich has no handwriting recognition unit either. Obradovich has a touch screen as follows:

"Interface 102a also incorporates well-known touch-screen circuitry (not shown) connected to touch screen interface 104a in FIG. 1. With this circuitry, the user can interact with processor 105 by, say, touching a displayed option on screen 209. Through interface 104a, processor 105 receives from the touch screen circuitry a signal identifying the location on screen 209 where it has been touched. If such a location matches the predetermined location of one of the displayed options, processor 105 determines that that option has been selected." (col. 5, lines 35 – 45)

From the above, it is clear that Obradovich uses touch screen buttons and not handwriting recognition.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 10, 21, 30 – 32.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8 – 19 and 21 – 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Oberteuffer et al. (US 6,438,523 B1) in view of Obradovich (US 6,282,464).

APPLICANT(S): Gabriel ILAN et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/674,710
FILED: January 29, 2000
Page 4

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Oberteuffer et al. is not prior art to the present application and Obradovich cannot cure this deficiency. As listed on the Filing Receipt of the present application (copy enclosed), the present application was accorded a filing date of January 29, 2000. However, the present application is a National Filing of PCT/IL99/00238, filed May 6, 1999, which claims benefit of US provisional application 60/084,520, filed May 7, 1998. Oberteuffer et al. is a utility application filed May 18, 1999 and claims benefit of provisional application 60/086,346, filed on May 20, 1998.

As can be seen from the above, the present invention has an effective filing date of May 6, 1999 which is before the May 18, 1999 filing date of Oberteuffer et al. Moreover, the present invention has a priority date of May 7, 1998 which is before the May 20, 1998 priority date of Oberteuffer et al. Thus, Oberteuffer et al. is not prior art to the present application.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 8 – 19 and 21 – 33.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

A reply to the Office Action dated October 16, 2002, is due January 16, 2003. Accordingly, this correspondence is being timely filed. No additional fees are believed due. However, the United States Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 501380 any fee which is necessary in connection with the filing of this reply.

APPLICANT(S): Gabriel ILAN et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/674,710
FILED: January 29, 2000
Page 5

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel J. Swirsky
Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 45,148

ALPHAPATENT ASSOCIATES LTD.
P.O.B. 2345
BEIT SHEMESH, ISRAEL 99544
TEL. 011 972 2 999 1035
FAX. 011 972 2 999 7638
EMAIL: dswirsky@alphapatent.com